

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

By the present preliminary amendment the specification is amended to correct minor informalities and recite additional suggested headings.

Claims 1-8 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4-5, and 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,428,361 to Imschweiler et al. (herein "Imschweiler"). Claims 2, 3, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Imschweiler in view of U.S. patent 6,227,911 to Boutros et al. (herein "Boutros").

Initially, applicants note the cited art to Boutros has not officially been made of record in the above-identified application. Specifically, that reference was not cited on the form PTO-892 accompanying the Office Action. Applicants request that reference be formally be made of record and cited on a form PTO-892.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 1, 4-5, and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as anticipated by Imschweiler, and the rejection of claims 2, 3, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Imschweiler in view of Boutros, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

Applicants initially note independent claim 1 is amended by the present response to incorporate limitations from previously pending dependent claim 5. Specifically, independent claim 1 now recites:

wherein said second terminal block is incorporated on a back surface side of said housing, while said internal board is provided between said first terminal block and said second terminal block.

According to such a feature in claim 1, and with reference to Figures 6A and 6B in the present specification as a non-limiting example, the second terminal block 5 is incorporated on a back surface side of a housing 1, while the internal board 6 is provided between the first terminal block 3 and the second terminal block 5. With such a structure a compact modular jack can be realized.

Such a claimed structure is believed to clearly distinguish over the teachings in Imschweiler, which was cited with respect to such features in original dependent claim 5. More particularly, in Imschweiler element 82, cited as corresponding to the claimed "internal board", is not formed between element 30, cited as corresponding to the claimed "first terminal block", and element 84, cited as corresponding to the claimed "second terminal block". Further, in Imschweiler that element 84, cited as corresponding to the claimed "second terminal block", is not incorporated on a back surface side of the element 20, cited as corresponding to the claimed "housing".

More particularly, as shown for example in Figures 12 and 13 in Imschweiler element 84, which is noted as an insert assembly in Imschweiler, is provided at a bottom portion of a printed circuit board 82, and as shown for example in Figure 17 appears adjacent to element 30. That is, in Imschweiler insert assembly 82 is not formed between elements 30 and 84, in contrast to the claimed features.

Further, in Imschweiler insert assembly 84 does not form a back surface side of housing 20. Again as shown for example in Figures 16 and 17, in Imschweiler insert assembly 84 extends off of a bottom edge of housing 20, and clearly does not form a "back surface side" of the housing 20.

In such ways, applicants respectfully submit amended independent claim 1, and the claims dependent therefrom, patentably distinguish over the teachings in Imschweiler.

Moreover, no teachings in Boutros were cited with respect to the above-noted features, and no teachings in Boutros are believed to overcome the above-noted deficiencies in Imschweiler.

Applicants also note dependent claim 5 is amended by the present response to now recite "wherein said first terminals project out directly rearward from said first terminal block and said second terminals are L-shaped". Such features are also clearly shown for example in

the original specification in Figure 3B showing the first terminals having a portion 2b projecting directly rearward from the first terminal block 3, and Figure 4F showing the second terminals 4 being L-shaped. Such features recited in dependent claim 5 are believed to even further distinguish over the teachings in Imschweiler.

More particularly, the terminals 22 in Imschweiler, cited as corresponding to the claimed "first terminals", do not project out directly rearward from the element 30, and the terminals 26 in Imschweiler, cited as corresponding to the claimed "second terminals", are not L-shaped. Thus, dependent claim 5 is believed to even further distinguish over the applied art.

The present response also rewrites claim 7 in independent form, and the subject matter therein is believed to also clearly distinguish over the applied art.

First, applicants note that the Office Action has not even addressed the specific limitations set forth in now independent claim 7. In that respect applicants further note that the cited art to Imschweiler does not disclose or suggest the features recited therein that the connection portion of the first and second terminals to the internal board project rearward, and further that a cover covering the internal board is provided on the back surface side of the housing. Thus, independent claim 7 is believed to also distinguish over the applied art.

In view of these foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit each of currently pending claims 1-8 distinguish over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
SNS/rac



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423